



## *DRAFT MEETING NOTES* Alert and Warning Workshop

Tuesday, June 24, 2008

10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

OES Headquarters | 3650 Schreiver Avenue, Mather, CA 95655

---

**Meeting Purpose:** Second meeting of Work Group to implement the provisions of AB2231 (Pavley) regarding enhancing alert, notification and warning system in California through public private partnerships.

**Desired Outcomes:** Shared perspectives by ~~selected~~ all stakeholders; updates on efforts by Sub groups thus far; information sharing and suggested additional direction on key aspects of the Pavley legislation.

**Action Items:**

1. The PowerPoint slides from Val Lucas', U.C. Davis, presentation will be put onto the Alert and Warning website.
2. The next meeting of the Alert and Warning full group will be during the week of September 15, 2008. [Post meeting the date was set as: TUESDAY, **SEPTEMBER 16, 2008**, 10 am – 3pm.]
3. Participants wishing to become active in the 5 work teams should reference the OES website or contact the facilitation team (Jeffrey Sharp, [Jsharp@ccp.csus.edu](mailto:Jsharp@ccp.csus.edu))

---

### **Welcome and Call to Order**

Meeting Facilitator Adam Sutkus, California State University, Sacramento, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP), called the meeting to order. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending this second full meeting of the statutorily created project. After introductions by all present with their name and organization, Mr. David Zocchetti of CA-OES offered formal opening remarks to the group.

---

### **Chair's Comments—David Zocchetti, Governor's Office of Emergency Services (CA-OES):**

David Zocchetti, Chief Counsel for CA-OES, welcomed everyone to the meeting on behalf of CA-OES. Mr. Zocchetti mentioned that he had been involved in the formation of Assembly Bill 2231 (Pavley) when it was being developed two years ago. The bill addresses both technology impediments as well as regulatory challenges, including social issues and governance of alert and warning notification systems in California.

Mr. Zocchetti said that the standards that are being developed at the Federal level will help to understand the framework under which alert and warning systems should be developed. The Emergency Digital

Information Service (EDIS) is still a core tool, along with developing professional standards of conduct and templates for common terminology. Mr. Zocchetti reminded the group that these are issues that California has dealt with for decades in one way or another, but that he was excited for this group to tackle those issues now, in a coordinated and collaborative fashion.

Mr. Sutkus reviewed the agenda, process, and ground rules for the meeting. He mentioned that there would be two presentations at the meeting. Also, three of the five work teams had met and the notes from those meetings were included in the packet. He encouraged the meeting participants to become involved with the work teams as much as possible. There would be a chance later in the day to break into the work teams and discuss key issues. Mr. Sutkus also highlighted a document that the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) provided which gives a good snapshot about what is going on at the Federal level.

---

## Technology Contractor Update

David Zocchetti gave the group an update on the CA-OES technology contractor. There are many alert and warning systems currently in place at the Local government level, and understanding their scope will be critical to designing future systems for the state. The purpose of the technology contractor is to explore these different systems including how they work, what combinations work best, and what other states are doing. Mr. Zocchetti explained that CA-OES is currently going through the process of hiring a consultant to accomplish this task. There are currently six proposals that are being considered. However, the contract cannot be finalized before the State budget is signed, which could be several months down the road.

Adam Sutkus said that there may be an opportunity in the future to have a vendor day where vendors would be able to come and speak about their products. The Public Safety Radio Strategic Planning Committee (PSRSPC) had an interoperability vendor day two years ago that was highly successful. Mr. Sutkus thought that the Alert and Warning group may be able to utilize a similar structure. He then asked the group for input about what form the vendor day might take to maximize the information exchange.

### Discussion/Suggestions:

- ✚ Allow 45 minutes per vendor including the presentation and the product demonstration.
- ✚ The vendor day should happen about three quarters of the way through the process now underway, possibly in October.
- ✚ It may be beneficial for the technology consultant to conduct a thorough needs assessment so as to maximize vendors' time.
- ✚ Have the vendors respond to specific questions that the work teams develop over time as they consider their specific issues
- ✚ Accessibility issues—explore capabilities for Tele-Type and video capability. Vendors should be prepared to demonstrate these technologies at the vendor day.
- ✚ One pre-qualification is that the systems being demonstrated should be currently operable and commercially available (no proto-types).

The group then approved the March 27, 2008 meeting minutes with no changes.

---

## Selected Key Perspectives

Continuing the approach started at the first full Working Group meeting, two more specific perspectives were offered. Adam Sutkus reminded the group that there are many key viewpoints to be educated about through this process, and at each meeting these will be highlighted.

### **Emergency Digital Information Service (EDIS), Ben Green, CA-OES:**

Ben Green gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Emergency Digital Information Service (EDIS). In 2004 the Common Alerting Protocol (CAP) became a world-wide standard to which all systems will adhere. EDIS now breaks the state into counties. The system allows the county to further target information. At least one county has targeted it by zip code. The ultimate goal is to be able to target the audience of messages down to the neighborhood level.

Mr. Green explained that redundancy is a huge issue that has to be explored, even in the context of CAP. Satellite redundancy is not quite in place yet. While CA-OES maintains the “pipeline” for information, it does not control every tentacle. Users can subscribe to the EDIS server in many different ways, and through many different types of media. Mr. Green said that the proven most effective, cheapest way to reach the public is through radio. He underscored the importance of realizing that the new generation is one based on wireless technology.

#### **Discussion:**

- ✚ One of the biggest current problems is the method of distribution; the content of the message is not as problematic. For alerts such as the Amber Alert, common language is currently being used. However, it is not permanent and will also need to be addressed in the future.
- ✚ The EDIS element of the software is very easy to use and has proven to be very robust and highly expandable.
- ✚ Both passive (opt in) and active (no need to opt in) technology needs to be considered. This brings up the issue of regulating the registration of devices into a database. The future system will likely need to incorporate a combination of both passive and active technology and policies.
- ✚ When using the broadcast stations the deaf community is not being reached. When using text messaging the blind community is not being reached. It is important to consider all technology solutions in an effort to reach all vulnerable populations. With proper design, EDIS has the capacity to accommodate these and other key elements of Alert and Warning.

### **Higher Education Perspective, Val Lucas, University of California, Davis:**

Val Lucas gave a PowerPoint presentation from the higher education perspective. The Virginia Tech shootings in 2007 were a driving force in the development of the Pavley legislation. The three most important needs identified as a result of this tragic incident were better gun control, better student health, and better alert and warning notification.

The current generation is a wireless generation that demands technological solutions to these issues. The advent of social networking websites has paved the way for lateral communication across many different interfaces.

Ms. Lucas explained that she had some U.C. Davis students conduct a campus-wide survey as part of an honors challenge project, asking students which ways they would prefer to be notified of emergency situations on campus. The number one way students preferred to be contacted was through *text messaging*. The secondary choice was public address system, as some parts of campus (such as basements classrooms) are wireless “dead zones. Furthermore, 83% of students indicated that they would be willing to pay for emergency text messages if they were required to do so. Contact information is kept current by requiring update during the registration process.

The current U.C. Davis emergency alerting system has two different message classifications: 1) emergency and; 2) urgent—no immediate threat. Ms. Lucas underscored the importance of considering text messaging character limits, as text messages are limited to a certain length. U.C. Davis’ emergency alerting system is currently CAP compatible and will work with a variety of platforms and devices. In the U.C. Davis alerting system database there are currently 63,000

contacts. There is no “opt out” option in their system. The University is also currently exploring other new systems such as Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP), sirens, and message boards.

Ms. Lucus emphasized the importance of considering the systems currently placed at community colleges and university campuses. These educational institutions consider themselves self sustaining entities that have a need for their own alerting systems to notify students and faculty of emergency situations.

#### Discussion:

- ✚ Messages that go out need to give the right information about what recipients need to do next. If not, recipients will call 911. There is also a need to match the student alerts with public information announcements that provide information to parents. This highlights the need for public education and clear messaging protocol.
  - ✚ A request was made to put the slides from Ms. Lucus’ presentation on the Alert and Warning website.
  - ✚ There is a huge expectation from the younger generations that any alerts sent out will reach them, no matter what media they might be using.
  - ✚ One participant felt that it was important to remember that alerting and warning is about an announcement, not having a conversation with message recipients.
- 

## **Alert and Warning Sub Groups – Efforts So Far**

Members of each of the three work teams that have met gave status updates on the work that has been done so far.

### **Standardization Work Team, Art Botterell, Contra Costa County:**

The Standardization Work Team primarily discussed standards of practice, rather than standards of technology. The work team felt that there must be a clear articulation of the State’s role and responsibility regarding standards of practice and system governance and maintenance. Mr. Botterell mentioned that there is a lot going on at the Federal level, and that the work team will need to be monitoring this activity as it relates to California’s alert and warning systems.

Technology standards are also important issues for the work team to tackle and there will be much overlap with the Technology Work Team. CAP will and has already provided the basis for those technology standards. Mr. Botterell also highlighted the need for evaluation systems. There is currently no system of metrics and no objective basis for evaluation. Also, information sharing is going to be a challenge. Database owners are very sensitive about sharing them with other agencies. There is currently no public database to which everyone has access. This will be crucial in the development of a statewide, accessible system. Training standards, consistent with SEMS and NIMS, are also needed and need to address the alert and warning function as distinct from the public information officer function.

### **Technological Issues, Lisa Prigozen, CPUC:**

The Technological Work Team has met twice so far. The first thing that this work team agreed to do was not discuss CAP. Work team members agreed that it is certain CAP will serve as the basic protocol for alert and warning systems in California, and thus did not need further discussion at this time. The work team looked at scalability rather than specific technological solutions, taking an open-architecture kind of approach. There are existing systems already in place that will need to be accounted for. Taking a System of Systems (SoS) approach, existing local, state, and regional

systems could be built upon to create a statewide interconnected network for systematic alerting and warning.

#### Discussion:

A question was raised about whether or not the State would work towards a single, standard system. Ms. Prigozen said that a SoS approach is likely the option the Technological Issues Work Team will be exploring. One of the key challenges will be that there is no control over the consumer electronics market. The system will be limited by gaps in technological options. Additionally, a constantly changing technical landscape underscores the need for management of those technical options in a flexible but coordinated approach. Another member pointed out the importance of keeping the Emergency Alert System (EAS) in mind. The final product should be able to carry a message from the White House all the way down to the local level.

#### **Social Issues Work Team, Mike Brown, Business, Transportation and Housing (BTH):**

One of the biggest issues that the Social Issues Work Team discussed was message content and template development. The work team agreed that the terminology should be common across all systems. Additionally, the work team discussed the issue of reaching vulnerable populations. All segments of society have to be considered, so as not to leave out any population of the community that needs to be reached. Training and education will be large components in the process of creating a statewide alert and warning System of Systems.

---

## **Breakout Exercises – Alert and Warning Work Teams**

The meeting room was divided into five sections, one for each alert and warning work team. Meeting participants were then allowed to participate on any work team they wanted. The facilitation team provided the work teams with a worksheet to help guide their discussions. Each work team was also provided with a facilitator to help with recording. The following are the highlights from each of those discussions.

#### **Technological Issues Work Team**

- ✚ People tend to get upset when there are many tests. Overuse of alerts is a big problem.
- ✚ It's important to keep in mind that there is a difference between "alert" and "information."
  
- ✚ An open architecture or "plug-n-play" based system will yield the best results.
- ✚ Technology providers are going to have to think about back-up power in the event that there is complete power failure. Redundancy is one of the biggest issues to be addressed.
- ✚ The CPUC has recently come out with a report on battery back-up power for cell towers. This may be a useful study to look at.
  
- ✚ Spam control and defense mechanisms need to be built in to all systems.
- ✚ New technology that will help deliver "geo-targeted" messages is currently being discussed. This will be a Federal standard and California will need to explore this technology.
- ✚ The vendor day needs to include current adaptive technology that can be used by the disabilities community.
  
- ✚ The key for the technology side is to keep it as simple as possible.
- ✚ It is important to focus on what technology people are using right now (e.g. cell phones).
- ✚ There is a real need for cooperation and collaboration from the different telecommunications carriers. Everyone seems to want to be involved. A huge barrier to this coordination is the legal and liability concerns for private companies.

- ✚ The technology work group needs to consider infrastructure sustainability standards. The issue of functionality vs. community aesthetics has already proved to be a point of contention in some communities.

### **Social Issues Work Team**

- ✚ Changing demographics will impact alert and warning in California.
- ✚ We need to consider the technological preferences of different age groups and cultures (e.g. text vs. radio).
- ✚ Public Information and Education:
  - Does the public know how to access the system?
  - Is there information on the website about how to register?
  - Need to consider public expectations.
  - Educate public about message that may go out and the corresponding actions to take.
- ✚ There is a difference between messages that pose an immediate threat to life and human safety, and those messages meant for public education.
- ✚ Consider “no-notice messaging” (earthquake) vs. “notice messaging” (pandemic influenza).
- ✚ Regional event coordination:
  - Public information officers
  - Use the Bay Area model:
    - Quarterly meetings, trainings, standard operating procedures (SOPs), tool kits
  - Network of multiple information sources (emergency management, public health, etc.)
- ✚ TTY Telephone notification
  - Need to consider routine use of telephone notification systems.
  - Need to educate the public to increase familiarity.
- ✚ What may work for a rural area may not work in an urban area.
- ✚ Need to consider role of social networks (faith-based, CBOs) as verification/information distribution sources.
- ✚ Consider the cross border issues with Mexico/Canada.
- ✚ Prisons and parolees—how are messages handled to these populations?

### **Legal & Liability Work Team**

- ✚ Who has the ability to issue alerts? What if there is a negative result? Where does the liability go?
  - State, local or Federal
  - Jurisdiction vs. authority
  - Ramifications of actions
  - There needs to be a requirement to “act” on information.
  - Locals do not want a standard or requirement to be instituted.
  - Need to outline social expectations, can’t be told “everything.”
- ✚ Personal responsibility needs to be taken into consideration—there currently exists a “risk” for someone who issues an alert.
- ✚ There is a need for statutory liability protection.
  - Keep it high level and not too detailed/specific.
  - “due diligence”
  - Involves “personal, private sector, and government”
- ✚ Public education campaign needed to understand limitations of systems.



## **Standardization Work Team**

- ✚ Accessibility focus for people with disabilities is key.
- ✚ Training standards need to be a priority.
- ✚ Keep the system and message as simple as possible – focus on “who, what, when, where, how”.
- ✚ Hospitals and medical facilities need to be more involved in discussions about alert and warning.
- ✚ Information/data sharing between agencies is needed.

## **Funding Work Team**

There were no participants at the Funding Work Group table.

---

## **Breakout Exercises – Other Pavley Related Issues**

The meeting room was divided into 4 sections and meeting participants were again given the option to participate in any work group they wanted. The groups discussed other outstanding issues related to alert and warning notification that were outside of the scope of the five work teams, but mentioned in the Pavley legislation. Each group then reported back their discussion findings to the whole group.

### **Families of First Responders**

- ✚ Notification between first responder and the family—there should be multiple ways of notification (first responder wants to know family is taken care of).
- ✚ Challenges/gaps:
  - Training, Education, Maintenance
- Potential Solutions:
  - Have a call-in center for families to get information
  - Ombudsman—talking to families
  - Alert network—each agency needs to maintain point of contact for their employee, alert rosters
  - Pre-listed points of contact to contact families
  - Website information system

### **Pilot Projects of Public-Private Partnerships**

- ✚ Non-profit CA public-private partnership for public A+W
  - Stakeholders from industry, government, academics, strategic policy guidance
- ✚ Partnership for public warning (at national level)—it disbanded
- ✚ National Association for State Broadcasting Associations (NASBA) and National Association for Broadcasters (NAB) Emergency Alert Systems (EAS) summits
- ✚ Interoperability demos (similar to vendor day)—in order to ‘play’, companies’ equipment has to be interoperable
- ✚ Business Executives for National Security (BENS)

### **Educate Californians**

- ✚ Wireless companies needing to educate their customers—what can their cell phones do?
- ✚ Challenges:
  - Vendor demonstration of capabilities
  - Awareness of Systems
  - Lack of knowledge about emergency preparedness

- Tech literacy
- Standardization of messages
- ✚ Potential Solutions:
  - Use Chamber of Commerce to reach businesses
  - Celebrity endorsements
  - Emergency Fairs
  - General disaster awareness training
  - K-12 training, adult training. Department of Education should be mandating curriculum.
  - Advertise "opt-in" system (print it on phone bill)
  - Wireless companies need to educate their customers
  - Billboards
  - Specialized messages to public education campaigns directed towards disability, culture, and language issues

### **CBOs and NGOs**

- ✚ They play a major role in community
- ✚ Include United way, 2-1-1, and American Red Cross
- ✚ Definitely an area that needs to be plugged in
- ✚ Challenges:
  - 2-2-1 not statewide
  - Funding, regulation, enforcement
  - Limited staff/resources
- ✚ System of Systems approach—current system, new system?
- ✚ Potential Solutions:
  - Include in funding requirements for horizontal/vertical communications

### **Next Steps, Future Meeting Dates, Adjourn**

Adam Sutkus reviewed the structure of the project at this point. The goal is for each of the work teams to have two face-to-face meetings facilitated by CCP. All subsequent meetings will be held via teleconference, or locally in person if the team decides to do so. The information captured from the work team meetings will essentially be a "chapter" or section in the Report to the Legislature now taking shape. CCP's goal over the next month is to start compiling information gathered from the work teams into a straw document of the report, which will be available for comment prior to the next full group meeting. The next full group meeting will fall during the week of September 15, 2008.

[Post meeting the date was set as: TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2008, 10 am – 3pm.]



## Attendance

Allen, Betty (DMH)  
Bancroft, Mason (DGS)  
Brown, Lynn (Mountain View OES)  
Buehler, Vincent (OHS)  
Cummings, Bennett (SDSU)  
DeBeaux, John (CESA)  
DeCrescenzo, Joan (DGS-TD)  
DeJong, MaryLiz (ATT)  
Devyllder, Richard (CA-OES)  
French, Kristine (DGS)  
Gunther-Allen, Janette (DOJ)  
Koeneker, Patrick (OHS)  
Luke, Leslie (SD County OES)  
Masamitsu, Joyce (Verizon)  
Middleton, Katrina (211)  
Pachikara, Jim (CPUC)  
Prigozen, Lisa (CPUC)  
Robinson, Trina Rosa (DTS)  
Saroyan, Jason (Waterfall Mobile, Inc.)  
Simpson, Margot (School for the Deaf, Fremont)  
Wang, Xiaomei (Verizon)  
Webster, Bob (DTS)  
Whitten, Julie (CDPH)  
Williams, John (SJ County Sheriff's Dept.)  
Younce, Christian (T-Mobile USA)  
Litkouhi, Simin (CPUC)  
Brown, Mike (BTH)  
Dedo, John  
Spiegel, Sam (Cal Police Chief's)  
Pehl, Christian (SJ County Sheriff's Office)  
Cummings, Earle (DWR)  
Gabbert, Jim (EAS Chair)  
Kaufman, Angela (LA Department on Disability)  
K., Hogan (Circle Point)  
Frew, Suzanne (Circle Point)  
Botterell, Art (Contra Costa County)  
Stoffan, Cathi (CDCR)  
Lucus, Valerie (UC Davis)  
Carr, Steven (Mission Consulting)  
Cavalleo, Ken (Salvation Army)

Adam Sutkus  
Eileen Baumgardner  
Sarah Rubin  
Tyler Block

### **Documents and Materials Provided:**

- Agenda
- March 27, 2008 Draft Meeting Minutes
- AB 2231
- Current Activities at the Federal Level
- Draft Alert and Warning Charter
- Standing Ground Rules
- Working in Groups
- Funding Work Team Summary
- Social Issues Work Team Summary
- Standardization Work Team Summary
- Legal & Liability Work Team Summary
- Technological Issues Work Team Summary

## CCP Facilitation Team